

Applic. No. 10/695,365
Amdt. dated June 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 30, 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 are now in the application. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 have been amended. Claim 11 was previously cancelled.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1, 6-8, and 14-15 have been rejected as fully anticipated by Rau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,957) (hereinafter "Rau") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in Figs. 2 and 4 of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 call for, *inter alia*:

Applic. No. 10/695,365
Amdt. dated June 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 30, 2006

at least one rotary lead-through fluidically communicating with the internal pipe for feeding a temperature-controlled liquid directly into and out of the internal pipe such that a flow of the temperature-controlled liquid is confined within the internal pipe.

The Rau reference discloses a form cylinder (43) that has a feed tube (52) and a cooling chamber (53) connected to the feed tube by connection bores (55). Rau discloses that the cooling chamber is connected to a discharge duct (57), which removes the coolant from the form cylinder (43). Accordingly Rau discloses that the coolant flows into the cylinder by the feed tube (52) and out of the cylinder via the discharge duct (57)

The reference does not show at least one rotary lead-through fluidically communicating with the internal pipe for feeding a temperature-controlled liquid directly into and out of the internal pipe such that a flow of the temperature-controlled liquid is confined within the internal pipe, as recited in claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 of the instant application. The Rau reference discloses that the coolant flows from into feed pipe to the cooling chamber and out of the discharge duct. Rau does not disclose that the coolant flows directly into and out the feed pipe via a rotary lead-through. This is contrary to

Applic. No. 10/695,365
Amdt. dated June 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 30, 2006

the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which at least one rotary lead-through fluidically communicates with the internal pipe for feeding a temperature-controlled liquid directly into and out of the internal pipe such that a flow of the temperature-controlled liquid is confined within the internal pipe.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 6-8 and 15 are believed to be allowable as well.

Even though the claims are believed to be allowable over Rau the following remarks pertain to the non-obviousness of claims 1, 13, 14, and 15.

Rau explicitly discloses a cooling chamber (53) that is directly adjacent to the cylinder jacket (50). Accordingly, the coolant must be directed to the cooling chamber (53). A confinement of the coolant to the feed tube (52) of Rau would not allow the cooling chamber (53) to perform to the desired function, thereby destroying the function of the cooling chamber (53). Therefore, because a modification of Rau to confine the coolant flow within the feed tube (52) would destroy the function of the form cylinder in Rau, there is no motivation to modify Rau to confine the coolant flow to the feed pipe (52).

Applic. No. 10/695,365
Amdt. dated June 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 30, 2006

In the fourth paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 2, 3, 4, 9, and 16 have been rejected as being obvious over Rau (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,957) in view of Feller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,402) (hereinafter "Feller") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Feller does not make up for the deficiencies of Rau. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 9, and 16 are believed to be allowable as well.

Even though claim 16 is believed to be allowable, the following remarks pertain to claim 16.

Claims 16 recites that the webs are longitudinal webs running along the axis of the exposure drum over substantially an entire length of the exposure drum. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not modify Rau to include longitudinal webs as recited in claim 16. More specifically, Rau discloses a cooling chamber (53), which is directly adjacent the cylinder jacket (50) and which is separated from the feed pipe (52) by a separating tube (51). The cooling chamber (53) receives the coolant from the feed pipe. Accordingly, because the coolant is in direct contact with the cylinder jacket and because the separating tube is disposed between the cylinder jacket (50) and the feed pipe (52) a person of ordinary skill in the art is not provided with any motivation to modify Rau

Applic. No. 10/695,365
Amdt. dated June 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 30, 2006

to include longitudinal webs as recited in claim 16 of the instant application.

In the third paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claim 5 has been rejected as being obvious over Rau (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,957) in view of Vrotacoe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,535,674) (hereinafter "Vrotacoe") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Vrotacoe does not make up for the deficiencies of Rau. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 5 is believed to be allowable as well.

In the second paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claim 10 has been rejected as being obvious over Rau (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,957) in view of Feller (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,402) and further in view of Marmin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,967,036) (hereinafter "Marmin") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Marmin does not make up for the deficiencies of Rau and Feller. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 10 is believed to be allowable as well.

In the penultimate paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claims 12 and 13 have been rejected as being obvious over Rau (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,957) in view of Hosokawa. It is noted that the Examiner has yet again not given a Publication number for the Hosokawa reference in the rejection or on a form PTO-

Applic. No. 10/695,365
Amdt. dated June 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 30, 2006

892. Therefore, it is not known what reference the Examiner is using in the rejection. Accordingly, applicant cannot comment with respect to this rejection. The Examiner is kindly requested to clarify this rejection in any further Office action. It is however noted, as indicated above, that claims 12 and 13 are believed to be allowable over Rau and that a modification of Rau would destroy the function of Rau.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 12, 13, or 14. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 and 12-16 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Applic. No. 10/695,365
Amdt. dated June 28, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 30, 2006

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

June 28, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101